



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

opinion, and is calculated to arouse hostility throughout the civilized world."

In writing on the subject of the "American-Japanese Relations," a writer in the *Far Eastern Review* says:

"The greatest intrigue of the last decade seems to have for its purpose the undermining of the friendship existing between Japan and America. This propaganda is given publicity in the yellow press of the United States and Japan, and is egged on by a few irresponsible European writers. Little by little there has been created the impression that the interests of Japan and America were bound to clash. Now there is hardly a European writer who takes it upon himself to solve all the troubles that the Far East is heir to who does not declare that it will all end by conflict between Japan and America. While we are reading how France, England and Russia love Japan and are united together to preserve the world's peace, we find a few public men in each of these peace-loving nations declaring how unfortunate it is that America and Japan must proceed to destroy each other. Japan's pride is hurt by misquotations from speeches of prominent Americans, and America's pride is touched by lying reports from the yellow press of Japan.

"Japan must not permit herself to be misled, and if we are not mistaken, the leaders of thought of the empire are not so obtuse. It would be well if the citizens of America would seek the motive behind all this vicious and lying propaganda. It may serve the yellow press of America with a sensation once in a while, but it could not serve so continuously unless there were a purpose behind it. We do not believe that the lying reports of the speeches could have been made unless those who transmitted them were either by nature vicious or of that low order of creatures who so lack principle that they will lend themselves to the services of an organized campaign on the part of interests outside of the United States and Japan to precipitate troubles."

"It behooves the intelligent among the citizens of both nations to maintain great reserve in the reception of reports that serve to create a feeling of antagonism between the two peoples. It is certain that neither Tokyo nor Washington desire a conflict, and, so far as we can see, there is no motive for any change in that attitude."

I am informed that the international Press Association, which includes every representative in Tokyo of American and European journals, at a meeting held in that city recently, adopted a resolution declaring that newspaper men in Japan are unable to discover any basis in the circumstances or sentiment in Japan warranting the disquieting speeches now being made in this country in regard to the alleged warlike attitude of Japan. These newspaper men may be regarded as having voiced the feeling of the general Japanese public. Moreover, Count Komura, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, has expressed the opinion that war with the United States is inconceivable, and that "it would be a crime without excuse or palliation."

In view of the statements which have been made concerning the activity of Japan in building and maintaining a great navy, it is interesting to note the conditions of financial distress which prevail in that country. The recent loss of property through floods has been estimated at from fifty to seventy-five millions, and it will cost many millions to construct embankments which are nec-

essary to prevent a repetition of this disaster. One of Japan's leading statesmen, Mr. Matsuda, recently said: "The people are groaning under the heavy burden of taxation, and the slightest addition will be enough to crush them. The government's first duty is to lessen the burden." While one of the Tokyo papers, in commenting recently on the causes of dullness in business, said: "It is the heavy taxation borne by the people during and since the war that is robbing the people of their purchasing power, and producing depression in the commerce and industries of the country."

Mr. Chairman, there are a great many people in this country who have had the fear of war with Japan dinged into their ears year after year for the past ten years, until they rarely ever sleep at night without their slumbers being disturbed by a Japanese nightmare. [Laughter.] It is astounding when we stop to think of the extent to which we have gone in preparing to defend ourselves against imaginary enemies.

I remember, as does the gentleman from Alabama, that it was only five years ago that the world first heard the word "Dreadnought." That was in November, 1906, when England launched her first Dreadnought. At that time the estimate of the navy department for the increase of the navy had been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for transmission to Congress. It did not include an estimate for a Dreadnought, but at that session of Congress, in order to compete with Great Britain, an attempt was made in this House to authorize the construction of a Dreadnought. The authorization was not secured, however, until the succeeding Congress. Since then we have been constructing two of these great battle-ships each year. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, providing that but one Dreadnought be authorized, will prevail.

By War or Law?

BY REV. GEORGE L. CLARK.

Sermon preached in the Congregational Church, Wethersfield, Conn., on Peace Sunday, December 18, 1910.

Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God.—*Matthew 5: 8.*

In these days, so many centuries after the coming of the Prince of Peace, when fleet ships, steel rails, wires and wireless make all men neighbors and the gospel all men kin; when it is as easy for a merchant in Calcutta to buy an Underwood in Hartford as it was for Cornelius in Cæsarea to buy leather of Simon the tanner thirty miles away, it ought to be superfluous to ask afresh the question on which all civilization depends, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

It is hard to keep patient with men who repeat in a Rip Van Winkian way the antiquated phrases of brutal ages, "To be prepared for war is the surest way to preserve peace," "In peace prepare for war," "Our armaments are intended only for our protection, and are no menace to the nations." We would be tempted to leave such obsolete maxims to the tender mercies of Mr. Dooley were it not for the fact that so many are confused by them and do not realize that we are passing into a new age, and that before long battleships will appear as out of date as to us appear the red Indians who tomahawked our daring John Oldham.

To-day, ten days after the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Elihu Burritt, "apostle of international brotherhood," Connecticut's foremost man of peace," let us consider peace by battle or by law.

1. We look first at the dismal fact of war. War is childish. Settling disputes by fighting is of the grade of quarreling children. "It is," "It is n't," "I did," "You did n't," "If you don't let me play, I'll be mad with you." Hot words singe the air, then making up faces, then the slap and the finger nails. Suppose you and I fall out; you buy a Colt, I buy a Winchester; England has thirteen-inch guns, we fourteen-inch; Japan a twenty-seven thousand ton Dreadnought, we must have a thirty-thousander. It is all of a piece,—war is childish.

2. War is barbarous. Less so than in 1396, when Bajazet, after his victory over French and Hungarians, slaughtered all save a few whom he held for enormous ransom; killing mercilessly defenseless captives till the sharpened scimeter's edge was blunted, and the arm was too weary to wield the mace.

War is far less barbarous now than in those earlier days when the rule was that armed combatants taken in battle were either killed, enslaved or sold at the pleasure of the victor; but war, however softened by Red Cross or magnanimous victors — war, with its wounds, feverish and awful thirst, its fearful agony in bones crashed through and flesh dripping blood, its ghastly deaths and intolerable heartaches — war is barbarous.

Throw whatever glamour you may about it with martial music, silk banners, glittering bayonets, glowing language, war is barbarous; for its business is butchery of men, sending men the way of dusky death.

Years ago, when a father and son went to market in merry England, the father would say, "Boy, who's that yonder?" "That's a stranger, father." "Well, throw a brick at him." "A rude age," we say. What do we say when Admiral Robley Evans, who conducted our fighting President's big club fleet around the world, urges the creation of a fleet of sixteen battleships on the Pacific at a cost of two hundred millions, to make a great parade at the Panama canal fair, and give the yellow fellows to understand what a big bull pup we keep at our back door? War is not glorious, though the cause for which it wages may be. War is terrific, and, as Tolstoi so vividly pictured it, black as night and hideous as hell. War is barbarous.

3. War is costly. Fifteen billions of lives destroyed within the historic period by a process which selects the bravest and most virile for destruction, and forty billion dollars spent. This Christian nation spends two hundred millions annually on army and navy, a country with no near neighbors capable of hurting us, and no possible foe anywhere to attack us without facing bankruptcy. What would we not do if we could spend one hundred per cent. instead of sixty-eight per cent. of the national revenue to meet the needs of irrigation, waterways, poverty, disease and education in the useful arts of thousands of ambitious but penniless young people! Cease to bow down to the hideous war god, banish the childish, barbarous, costly war-fetich, what relief in the taxes which press heavily on the poor man's food, clothes, modest comforts! One shot from a big gun costs seventeen hundred dollars,—three years of a working man's wages, four years of a woman school teacher's salary, the cost of a working

man's house, a college education at four hundred and twenty-five dollars a year. A Dreadnought before the recent rise in prices cost ten million dollars, two-thirds of the total valuation of the grounds and buildings of all the colleges and universities in Massachusetts and Ohio; the cost of five hundred locomotives. It costs a million a year to maintain this useful machine, and in fifteen years, the scrap pile. The peaceful cruise of the fleet around the world, that American-Fijian war dance, would have built five hundred schoolhouses at twenty thousand dollars each, or given one hundred dollars to a hundred thousand families. What good did it do? It fanned the war embers, advertised our mighty nation on its brutal side, swung the national shillalah over sunny Japan, and infected South America, Australia and Asia with fleetitis. Two centuries hence men will talk about it as we do now about the bowie knife and pistol period in California. The armed peace of Europe for the last thirty-seven years cost one hundred and eleven billions, five billions less than the entire wealth of the United States. We spend as much for war as for all educational purposes, and the increase is with leaps and bounds. The average annual cost of army and navy for the eight years before the Spanish War was fifty-one and a half millions; for the eight years since that war one hundred and eighty-five and a half millions,—an increase of one hundred and thirty-four millions, a total increase of one billion, seventy-two million, or three hundred and sixty per cent., three times the cost of the whole irrigation scheme for a generation, three times the cost of the Panama Canal. The Massachusetts report for 1910 on the cost of living says that after carefully weighing all the causes the most far-reaching one is found to be militarism. War is costly.

4. War is commercially suicidal. Said Ruskin: "Business is restless and seeks carrion food." Richard Cobden said that the defense of her commerce was the argument which had decided England for most of her wars. But trade may fail to follow the flag, and tariff bargains the army and navy. Canadian orders go to France, Germany and Belgium, rather than to England. Unarmed Switzerland wages successful tariff war with Germany, armed to the teeth. Investments in unprotected Holland and Sweden are twenty per cent. safer than in protected powers. Sundown has fallen on the day when the brutal principle held, "To the victor belong the spoils." John Hay declared that war for commerce is the most futile and ferocious of human follies. It is like the cannibal fancy that the strength of the slain foe passes into the man who eats him. The Boer War cost England a billion dollars and hung another millstone about her neck, and the great nation was powerless to grasp one of the gains of industrialism supposed to belong to the conqueror, and consented to distasteful terms of South African independence, dictated in London by the very Boer generals who opposed her on the field of battle.

When wealth was in slaves, silver, gold and jewels, it could be carried away as booty. To-day it is in paper securities and foreign investments. Suppose Germany should loot the Bank of England, Berlin could not collect her debts in London. Commercial relations are now so widespread and intimate that nations shrink from the bankruptcy sure to follow great wars.

A few years ago France was offended with England for an African blunder; a century ago there would have

been war. The Paris Chamber of Commerce said: "We cannot have a war with England. It would mean commercial paralysis and widespread disaster." It invited the London Chamber of Commerce to visit Paris for a banquet and the danger passed.

"The stern alarms changed to merry meetings,
Our dreadful marches to delightful measures,
Grim-visaged war hath smoothed his wrinkled front."

Nations cannot afford to fight. War is commercially suicidal. That war is childish, barbarous, costly and commercially suicidal is admitted by clear-headed people who have no axe to grind in army and navy, no share in building ships and making guns, no interest in yellow journalism, and are able to release themselves from mediæval phrases.

Said Mr. Asquith, Prime Minister of England, a month ago: "The vast majority in the great countries desire peace and are opposed to war. We all admit the evil and deplore it, yet seem to be in a vicious circle."

The remedy for war barbarism is arbitration. Law for war; reason for battleships; good judgment for slaughter.

A supreme court of the nations, similar to the Supreme Court of the United States, could settle the difficulties between the lands. General Grant said there never was a time when some way could not have been found to prevent drawing the sword. So wise and careful a thinker as Judge Baldwin said last week of arbitration: "The times have presented the occasion; it is for the world to grasp it, and I believe it will." We are slowly moving out of the slime of barbarism into the clear air of intelligence. "International peace," said Senator Root, "is not so much a matter of diplomacy as of education." Nations will come by and by to treat one another not as ruffians, but as reasonable men. When you disagree with a man you do not knock him down or show him the muzzle of your gun. We listen *ad nauseam* to narrow and belated politicians, military fellows and gun-makers; too little to good judgment.

What danger is there that any other nation will attack us as long as we are decent? On December 24, 1914, we shall celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the close of our last war with England. Our only possible danger is from a troop of polar bears led by Dr. Cook, or a brigade of African elephants; yet people who do little thinking on the subject, or are hide-bound by the jargon of ages of brutal passion and selfishness, appeal for defense of the Panama Canal, and our wise President, to keep peace in the family, yields a mild consent. Suppose we spend fifty millions for that, the first hostile battleships appearing at either terminus would be able, when twelve miles away, in two hours to put the canal out of commission and render it useless for our own vessels. Unfortified, no nation at war with us would bombard the ends or send battleships through one by one to be picked up by our ships; the risk would be too great. Neutralizing is far wiser than fortifying, for under the Hague convention the nations are under bonds not to bombard unfortified coast towns. It was a long step toward peace to give a place a neutral status; Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Ionian Islands, Congo Free State and the Suez Canal are neutralized, and require neither military nor naval force; their interests are protected in peace and war. The only time that this principle was violated in the last hundred years was in 1846, when Austria annexed the Republic of Cracow.

Why are there no gunboats on the Great Lakes? no forts on the Canada line? Why are the fiercest people there the gentle revenue officers who apologetically glance at the collars and pajamas in our suit cases? Because of the provisions of the treaty of 1817.

The world moves out of barbarism, though not on the keen jump. In 1795 John Jay was burned in effigy for inserting an arbitration clause in a treaty with England. Since then there have been nearly three hundred arbitration treaties, one hundred in the last six years. One hundred and thirty treaties of obligatory arbitration have been made by nations in pairs since 1899. Even a scanty intelligence can see that questions of morals or law cannot well be settled by burning gunpowder. Vicious phrases, mediæval battle-cries, confusion of mind and brutality die hard. It may be some time before the old teasing, shallow arguments for enormous armaments will give way to common sense and Christian principle.

Poverty must be endured, disease suffered, old age remain uncheered, working men overtaxed, to support a stupendous and ghastly joke; but if America should dare to take the initiative, reduce her armament, declare decidedly for arbitration, other nations would follow her example and history would approve. Most of us will live to see the establishment of a permanent tribunal of international justice to settle by arbitration and according to the best judgment of the ablest jurists in the world all questions in dispute between the nations. The tomahawk era has gone to seed. When a boisterous fellow can prevent the sunrise by shaking a club, the cause of arbitral justice can be stopped. Perhaps the women will take up the work and exert their superb influence for peace.

The schools can do much to educate the public opinion of to-morrow. Prizes for the best essays on peace would kindle interest. Shining brass buttons and bear skin shakos will soon go the way of the red man's feather head gear.

Twenty-six of the forty-seven independent governments of the world were represented at the first Hague Conference in 1899, forty-four at the second, and thirty-five nations, representing nine-tenths of the inhabitants of the globe, voted for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration.

We hail the dawning day when will pass away the

"Armors

With busy hammers closing rivets up,
Giving dreadful note of preparation."

We welcome the parliament of nations, the federation of the world.

Do not think that the peace movement is weak and sentimental, with the motto, "Peace on any terms." The bold and stirring trumpet of war should give place to no humble jews-harp plaintfully wailing, "Peace at any cost." It is the substitution of reason, good judgment and Christian principle for grape shot. It is too late for fields of blood, heaps of slain, duels, cannibal ovens and the Indian war-whoop.

We seek not the dead calm won by violence or meek submission, but peace through justice and mutual respect for one another's rights. How can this be gained? An illustration will give my exact thought.

A few years ago two prosperous and high-spirited republics in South America, Chile and the Argentine Republic, were on the verge of war over the revival of an old dispute of seventy years' standing concerning the ownership of a territory of eighty thousand square miles. They

were increasing their armies, four big battleships were building in Europe for them, when the British ministers, powerfully supported by bishops, clergy and women, worked for peace. As a result the question at issue was submitted to the King of England, who entrusted the case to careful and expert jurists and geographers, who awarded a part of the territory to each republic. The result was cheerfully accepted. A treaty was made in June, 1903, pledging for five years to submit all questions to arbitration, the first general arbitration treaty ever concluded.

They agreed to reduce armies to police forces, stop building the battleships, diminish naval armaments. The result was remarkable. The money saved was used for coast and internal improvements. Chile turned her arsenal into a school for manual training; a railroad was thrown across the mountains. The old bitterness and distrust passed away, and, according to a suggestion of Bishop Benavente, on the spot where the war would have waged a statue of Christ was erected March 14, 1904, cast from cannon from an old fort. The statue is twenty-six feet high; the cross supported by the left hand is five feet higher; the right hand is stretched out in blessing. On a bronze tablet in the granite base is this inscription: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Chileans and Argentines break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

We who call ourselves a Christian nation can learn a lesson from our sisters in South America, at the feet of Him who commands us to love one another, who said, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called sons of God."

The "Holy Experiment" of Arbitration.

[In view of the present discussion of the question of an unlimited treaty of arbitration between our country and Great Britain, the following letter, written by John G. Whittier in November, 1887, will be read with interest.—ED.]

AMESBURY, 11th Mo., 9, 1887.

Dear Friend: It is a very serious disappointment to me that I am not able to be present at the welcome of the American Peace Society to the delegation from more than two hundred members of the British Parliament who favor international arbitration.

Few events have more profoundly impressed me than the presentation of this peaceful overture to the President of the United States. It seems to me that every true patriot who seeks the best interests of his country, and every believer in the Gospel of Christ, must respond to the admirable address of Sir Lyon Playfair and that of his colleagues who represent the workingmen of England. We do not need to be told that war is always cruel, barbarous and brutal, whether urged with ball and bayonet by professed Christians or by heathen with club and boomerang.

We cannot be blind to its waste of life and treasure and the demoralization which follows in the train, nor cease to wonder at the spectacle of Christian nations exhausting all their resources in preparing to slaughter each other, with only here and there a voice like that of Count Tolstoy in the Russian wilderness, crying in heedless ears that the Gospel of Christ is peace, not war, and

love, not hatred. The overture which comes to us from English advocates of arbitration is a cheering assurance that the tide of sentiment is turning in favor of peace among English-speaking peoples.

I cannot doubt that, whatever stump orators and newspapers may say for party purposes, the heart of America will respond to this generous proposal from our kin-folk across the water.

No two nations could be more favorably conditioned than England and the United States for making the "holy experiment" of arbitration. In our associations and kinship, our aims and interests, our common claims in the great names and splendid achievements of a common ancestry, we are essentially one people. Whatever other nations may do, we, at least, should be friends. God grant that this noble and generous appeal may not be made in vain. May it hasten the time when the only rivalry between us shall be the peaceful rivalry of progress and gracious interchange of good!

"When closer strand shall lean to strand
Till meet, beneath saluting flags,
The eagle of our mountain crags
The lion of our mother land."

I am truly thy friend,

JOHN G. WHITTIER.

"In Time of Peace Prepare for War."

BY LE ROY PARKER, ESQ.

In an argument sustaining a proposition at issue, the earnest advocate will often distort the meaning, and sometimes the wording, of a phrase of a constitution or statute, a clause in a contract or will, or even an ancient and well-known maxim, like the above, in order to make it fit the purpose of the argument.

How many times of late, since the discussion for and against large armaments has raged, have we heard and seen the aforesaid maxim quoted thus: "If you want peace prepare for war;" and upon that form has been based the proposition that preparedness for war is a guaranty of peace, and the stronger the preparedness the greater and surer the guaranty. Hence it must follow that it is the duty of all nations, peacefully inclined, to provide vast armaments in order that they may be secure from outside attack.

But the old maxim does not so read, nor mean all this. It means, rather, "If war *must* come, it is best to be prepared beforehand," and the time to prepare for a war that *must* come is in time of peace, when the energies and resources of a nation can best be devoted to such preparation. It never meant that, with no war problem, nations should expend billions of the people's money in mighty fortresses, navies and armies, to be a further drain upon their resources for continuous maintenance.

Followed to its logical conclusion, the misinterpreted maxim, "If you want peace prepare for war," would require each nation, as a policy of safety, to build up and maintain a war force equal, if not superior, to that of the most powerful nation on the globe, in order to demonstrate the futility of attack by any other power, and thus would be engendered a rivalry which would go on forever, compelling each nation to add army to army, fleet to fleet, for each one added to the fighting force of any other nation, until the entire resources of the world would be invested principally in ships, guns and warriors.